

96-98

From: Twntwn@aol.com
To: Twntwn@aol.com, FCC FCCINFO
Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 12:18 AM
Subject: Re: Lost income due to UNE-P

Second Notice.

CC: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein

From: Twntwn@aol.com
To: Twntwn@aol.com, FCC FCCINFO
Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 12:22 AM
Subject: Re: Lost income due to UNE-P

Your name, address and the telephone number or numbers involved with your complaint; (if telephone related)

Mr. Terry Nenni
405 Trailhead Way
Martinez, Ca 94553
925-228-4865

A telephone number where you can be reached during the business day;

925-824-7354

Specific information about your complaint, including the names of all companies involved with your complaint;

Federal Communications Commission, specifically Michael Copps. Jonathan Adelstein, Kevin Martin

Names and telephone numbers of the company representatives that you contacted, the dates that you spoke with these representatives, and any other information that would help process your complaint;

Federal Communications Commission, Kevin Martin

If telephone related, include a copy of the bill(s) listing the disputed charges;

Salary statements available on request.

What type of resolution are you seeking?

I am an employee of SBC and writing this complaint on my behalf. SBC has laid off thousands of employees, cut spending, and cut salaries. Part of my salary is variable, based on company performance. This variable amount was cut by 50% for last year, (payable this year). The key reason identified by management is unfair regulation, specifically UNE-P. The result is accelerated loss of 10 million lines (at

last count) most at below cost! You can't sell/lease below cost and expect to stay in business. Your policies have cost me personally, thousands of dollars. The FCC ruling announced today further accelerates my employer into financial disaster. The stock dropped 7.5 % today, down almost 70% from the high. Michael Copps. Jonathan Adelstein, Kevin Martin must take full responsibility for their actions. The variable component reduction to my income is \$5,302. As additional lost income is realized, or if I loose my job altogether as further cutbacks are announced, I will seek any and all lost income from the Federal Communications Commission, specifically Michael Copps. Jonathan Adelstein, Kevin Martin.

Mr. Terry Nenni

CC: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein

From: www-data
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 1:59 PM
Subject: Reject Bells' Monopoly Bid

Message from William H. Minter

519 N. 80 West
Lindon, Utah
84042

Dear FCC Commissioner: Elimination of competitive access to wholesale phone networks will kill local competition and leave consumers with the worst of both worlds, an unregulated monopoly. Please reject the Bells self serving proposals to eliminate the UNE-Ps, which would pave the way for a bigger, meaner phone monopoly unrestrained by regulatory oversight. Add on charges are exorbitant and raised costs only will raise these taxes. Delete this planned action forever.

Sincerely, William H. Minter

Generated by :
EasyForm - Copyright 1999 by Thomas J. Delorme
<http://getperl.virtualave.net>

From: Wayne Harris
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 9:57 AM
Subject: **Very* disappointed in yesterday's ruling on broadband*

Dear Mr. Copps:

I am not speaking for my employer, but as a Vice President of Technology for a local Chamber of Commerce and as a residential consumer of broadband, I am extremely disappointed in the FCC's decision yesterday freeing the major telecommunications companies to extend their monopolies to broadband Internet access.

This quote from Carl Oppedahl, founder of the Ruby Ranch Network, excerpted from a CNET article "DSL customers brace for higher prices" says it better than I could:

"The FCC seems to have given no thought to the plight of the actual customer," said Oppedahl, who helped set up the co-op in 2001 because commercial DSL service wasn't offered in his neighborhood. "We're all still reeling in shock from yesterday's ruling."

I don't have a paid lobbyist in Washington, but you need to understand that there are a lot people like me throughout the country who are paying close attention to this issue.

Wayne Harris
Tallahassee, Florida

From: nbroyles@igc.org
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 1:20 AM
Subject: Reject Bells' Monopoly Bid

Message from Nancy M. Broyles

740 Flora Vista Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Dear FCC Commissioner:
Elimination of competitive access to
wholesale phone networks
will kill local competition and leave
consumers with the worst of both
worlds, an unregulated monopoly.
Please reject the Bells self serving
proposals to eliminate
the UNE-Ps, which would pave the
way for a bigger, meaner phone
monopoly unrestrained by regulatory
oversight.

Sincerely,
NANCY M. BROYLES

Generated by :
EasyForm - Copyright 1999 by Thomas J. Delorme
<http://getperl.virtualave.net>

From: Kinsey Lowe
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 1:08 PM
Subject: Telco deregulation

Mr. Copps:

This may be long, but please bear with me.

From my perspective, at least in California and with SBC, deregulation and subsequent consolidation has not worked out. In fact, even the 1996 law has resulted in vastly degraded service, at least from the customer service standpoint. SBC is interested in acquiring companies and increasing stock value and wealth, not providing real service.

Before the merger of SBC and Pacific Bell, dealing with the phone company was never a chore or unpleasant. Service was prompt and efficient with virtually no waiting on hold for a Pacific Bell representative. In 1998 I acquired DSL service, and the experience was excellent, download speeds sometimes as high as the initially advertised 1.5 megabytes per second. It's a great product, under the right circumstances. I had two phone lines in my home, one for business and internet, the other personal. I chose Pacific Bell for my mobile service.

When SBC merged with Pacific Bell, I didn't notice much change at first. Then when I purchased a new home in a different neighborhood in Los Angeles in April of 2000, I experience moderate waiting time on hold, 45 seconds to maybe 5 minutes, in making arrangements for the move. When I actually moved, I found my self-install DSL software didn't allow me to connect.. I am fairly technically adept at following instructions, and installed the software per instructions left by the wiring installer.

I experienced multiple long waits on hold, never less than 30 minutes, sometimes as long as 45. This was particularly annoying on a couple of occasions when I was disconnected after waiting, only have to dial in again and wait another 45 minutes to speak to a service representative who didn't always have the expertise to solve the problem. Since I do have to sleep and since my job does require that I actually be at work for as much as 12 hours on many days, this process of actually getting the DSL service to work took nearly two months. I remember it was definitely more than six weeks but I cannot say for sure that it actually took two months. It did however take many phone calls, two subsequent visits by technicians who gave me special phone numbers to call to attempt to minimize any waits on hold. One of them even gave me his cell phone number because he thought what was happening to me was outrageous.

It turns out because I am at the outer limit of the maximum distance from the telephone exchange that my service had to be capped at 384K download speed (in practice, 327K) but I still pay the full \$49.95 per month. A technician obtained a static IP address to ensure stability, on the grounds that I was not a new customer but an existing customer.

I have tried to upgrade to increased speeds, but I have been unable to get via e-mail an indication that anyone knows what I am talking about when I explain my situation. I asked if there was any time frame for SBC to upgrade its system with satellite DSL hubs or connection points that would bring it closer to my home. Some e-mails to SBC received NO response, and most received what amounted to form responses that indicated the person on the service end either had not actually read my e-mail or did not understand it. A person I reached by phone said it was not possible to upgrade, but the SBC website indicates otherwise.

My cable company (Adelphia, ahem) does not yet offer high-speed internet service, so I stuck with SBC another year or so since I was reasonably satisfied with the service but not thrilled as I had been at the old location. Then the other day I e-mailed Covad, explaining my situation, and I received a response within 24 hours offering a guaranteed speed of 1 megabyte per second and possibly as high as 1.5, for about \$20 more a month. I signed up, but I could cancel at any time for 30 days.

I decided to give SBC another try. Previously I had found that someone answered the phone much more quickly when SBC was selling something, but this did not happen. After waiting for 2 minutes while I was busy at work, my memory came back of all the headaches of waiting endlessly on hold for someone in DALLAS who might or might not be able to answer my questions, I hung up. I'll see what happens with Covad, which maintains some of its own equipment. I managed to sign a contract that will freeze my rate for two years so the FCC's recent telco decision will not affect my rates.

Because I have two phone lines, I was able to switch my local service this year to MCI, which was my long distance carrier long before the crook Bernie Ebbers got involved. I've had no problems with MCI and I get a flat rate for a package including long distance, voice mail, call forwarding and waiting and caller i.d. on that line, for about the same as my lowest bill under SBC. I had kept my separate DSL and work phone line with SBC out of loyalty to PacBell to see if anything got better, but I see that it hasn't. SBC will get the \$20 or so for a simple tone service but that line is not used for long distance, and soon they won't get my DSL service either.

The federal government has been listening too long to lobbyists who want to make it easier for stock traders to make money swapping stock and arranging mergers rather than creating products or delivering real service. The real reason regulation came into being in the first place is because business as a whole ultimately could not be relied upon to police itself. Self-regulation is a fiction, and the situation in the airline industry, contrary to popular belief, I think demonstrates it perfectly, at least in terms of the big carriers.

Thank you for your attention.

Incidentally, I have no complaint about any my taxes. Someone has to pay for upkeep. Unlike a lot of Republicans and some Democrats in Congress, I understand that bills have to be paid.

Respectfully,

(Ronald) Kinsey Lowe
Citizen, homeowner, taxpayer and voter
4156 Ranons Avenue
Los Angeles

From: johnr@overland.net
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 12:27 PM
Subject: Your recent ruling giving the Bells the Internet

I hope you are all able to get adequate rest after the recent vote you made concerning rate structuring for the baby-Bells with regard to internet fixed rate leasing. Personally, I would have been concerned that people would see this decision as a sell-out to big business by a Republican appointed commission.

We would not even have an Internet were it not for ISP's being the adventurous entrepreneurs that they are (no Bells, nor AT&T nor IT&T were willing to initially take the risk). They, the ISP's, took enormous capital risks and devoted years to the development and growth of the Internet as we know it today, AI really had noting to do with it. When the babyBells and At&T and the other huge corporations finally got on the train it was traveling full speed with little to no risk involved except for the competition of these pesky little ISP's that they were locked into with rate structured contract leases.

What a grand way to pay back the risk, hard work, and years of dedicated service the ISP's put into building this wonderful thing we call the Internet. You should all be proud of yourselves, any good republican would.

Thanks fellas, you've once again confirmed my belief that social reform and the Republican Party are anathema to one another.

Thank You,

John Rayburn

From: www-data
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Feb 22, 2003 1:59 PM
Subject: Reject Bells' Monopoly Bid

Message from William H. Minter

519 N. 80 West
Lindon, Utah
84042

Dear FCC Commissioner: Elimination of competitive access to wholesale phone networks will kill local competition and leave consumers with the worst of both worlds, an unregulated monopoly. Please reject the Bells self serving proposals to eliminate the UNE-Ps, which would pave the way for a bigger, meaner phone monopoly unrestrained by regulatory oversight.

Add on charges are exorbitant and raised costs only will raise these taxes. Delete this planned action forever.

Sincerely, William H. Minter

Generated by :
EasyForm - Copyright 1999 by Thomas J. Delorme
<http://getperl.virtualave.net>